

EXHIBIT A

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

**IN RE VERINT SYSTEMS INC. AND VERINT
AMERICAS INC.,
*Petitioners.***

2015-100

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia in No. 1:14-cv-00260-TWT, Judge Thomas W. Thrash, Jr.

ON PETITION

Before NEWMAN, DYK, and HUGHES, *Circuit Judges.*
DYK, Circuit Judge.

O R D E R

Petitioners Verint Systems, Inc. (“VSI”) and Verint Americas, Inc. (“VAI”) (collectively, “Verint”) seek a writ of mandamus that would, inter alia, vacate an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia granting the motion of Respondent Envision Telephony, Inc. (“Envision”) to transfer venue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).

On January 29, 2014, Verint filed this case in the Northern District of Georgia (“the NDGA”), alleging that

Envision's software products infringe several patents. Envision, a Washington corporation, filed a motion to transfer venue to the Western District of Washington (the "WDWA"). Verint opposed, but the NDGA district court granted the motion and on the same day terminated the case, transferring the case files to the WDMA. Four days later, the case was docketed in the WDMA.

The district court that decided the transfer motion has closed the case and transferred it completely. Under such circumstances, it is ordinarily the proper course for the party to ask the district court that currently maintains jurisdiction to retransfer the case to the transferor court. *See, e.g., In re Nine Mile Limited*, 673 F.2d 242, 244 n.5 (8th Cir. 1982); *Linnell v. Sloan*, 636 F.2d 65, 67 (4th Cir. 1980); *Starnes v. McGuire*, 512 F.2d 918, 924 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (en banc).

We deny mandamus without prejudice to petitioners' seeking retransfer from the WDMA district court.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The petition is denied.

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Daniel E. O'Toole
Daniel E. O'Toole
Clerk of Court